	UNITED STA	ATES D	ISTRICT COURT	
	NORTHERN D	ISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA	
IN DE. DACIEIC E		. [
LITIGATION	ERTILITY CENTER		Case No. 18-cv-01586-JSC	
			PROPOSED VERDICT FOR	M
	es No	-	ect when it left Chart's possession question 2. If you answered no, d	
	d go to question 3.	answer	question 2. If you unswered no, a	o noi unswer
2. Was the ma	nufacturing defect a	substant	ial factor in causing harm to Plair	ntiffs?
Rosaly	nn Enfield:	Yes	No	
Laura	Parsell:	Yes	NI.	
			NO	
Kevin		Yes		
	Parsell:	Yes	No	
			No	
Chloe	Parsell:	_Yes	No No	

27

28

II. DESIGN DEFECT 1 **CLAIM 2: CONSUMER EXPECTATIONS TEST** 2 3 3. Did Tank 4 fail to perform as safely as an ordinary user of cryogenic storage tanks 4 would have expected when used or misused in an intended or reasonably foreseeable 5 way? 6 ____ Yes ____ No 7 8 Regardless of your answer to question 3, proceed to question 4. 9 10 **CLAIM 3: RISK BENEFIT TEST** 11 12 4. Did the benefits of the tank's design outweigh the risks of the design? 13 14 ____ Yes ____ No 15 *If you answered yes to either question 3 or question 4, answer question 5.* 16 • If you answered no to both question 3 and question 4, but yes to question 2 (as to any plaintiff), proceed to question 6. 17 • If you answered no to question 2 (as to each plaintiff), question 3, and question 4, 18 skip questions 5-7, and proceed to question 8. 19 5. Was the tank's design a substantial factor in causing harm to plaintiffs? 20 Rosalynn Enfield: ____ Yes ____ No 21 ____ Yes ____ No Laura Parsell: 22 23 ____ Yes ____ No **Kevin Parsell:** 24 ____ Yes ____ No **Chloe Poynton:** 25

Proceed to question 6.

Adrienne Sletten:

____ Yes ____ No

Northern District of California

III.	CHART'	'S AFFIRMATIV	E DEFENSE:	: MISUSE	OR MODIFICATIO	N

6. Was Tank 4 misused or modified after it left Chart's possession in a way that was so highly extraordinary that it was not reasonably foreseeable to Chart?
Yes No
If you answered yes to question 6, then answer question 7. If you answered no, skip question 7 and go to question 8.
7. Was the misuse or modification the sole cause of Plaintiffs' harm?

Proceed to question 8.

____ Yes ____ No

IV.	CLAIM 4	4:	NEGLIGENT	FAIL	JURE TO	RECALL	OR	RETROFIT

8. Did Chart know or should it reasonably have known that Tank 4's controller was
dangerous or was likely to be dangerous when used in a reasonably foreseeable manner?
Yes No
If your answer to question 8 is yes, then answer question 9. If you answered no, do not answer questions 9 - 12 and go to question 13.
9. Did Chart become aware of this defect after the tank was sold?
Yes No
If your answer to question 9 is yes, then answer question 10. If you answered no, do not answer questions 10 - 12 and go to question 13.
10. Did Chart fail to recall or retrofit the tank's controller?
Yes No
If your answer to question 10 is yes, then answer question 11. If you answered no, do not answer questions 11 - 12 and go to question 13.
11. Would a reasonable manufacturer under the same or similar circumstances have
recalled or retrofitted the tank's controller?
Yes No
If your answer to question 11 is yes, then answer question 12. If you answered no, do not answer question 12 and go to question 13.
//

Case 3:18-cv-01586-JSC Document 838 Filed 06/04/21 Page 5 of 11

12. Was Chart's failure to rec	all or retrofit the tank's controller a substantial factor in
causing harm to plaintiffs	?
Rosalynn Enfield:	Yes No

Laura Parsell: Yes ____ No

Kevin Parsell: Yes _____ No

Chloe Poynton: Yes ____ No

Adrienne Sletten: Yes ____ No

Proceed to next page

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

	V.	COM	PENSA	TORY	DAN	ΜA	GES
--	----	-----	-------	------	-----	----	-----

- If you answered yes to either question 2 or 5 (as to at least one plaintiff), and no to questions 6 or 7, answer question 13 as to the plaintiffs for whom you answered yes in questions 2 and/or 5.
- If you answered no as to questions 2 and 5 as to every plaintiff or you answered yes to question 7, and you answered yes as to any plaintiff in question 12, answer question 13 as to the plaintiffs for whom you answered yes in question 12.
- If you answered no to questions 2 and 5 as to every plaintiff, or you answered yes to question 7, and you answered no to any of questions 8-11 and all of question 12, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form on the last page.
- 13. What are each plaintiff's damages?

Rosalynn Enfield:

Economic loss

Value of damaged/lost eggs: \$ _____

Noneconomic loss

Pain, suffering, and emotional distress: \$_____

Rosalynn Enfield TOTAL \$ _____

Laura & Kevin Parsell:

Economic loss

Value of damaged/lost embryos: \$ _____

Noneconomic loss

Laura Parsell pain, suffering, and emotional distress: \$_____

Kevin Parsell pain, suffering, and emotional distress: \$_____

Laura & Kevin Parsell TOTAL \$ _____

Chloe Poynton:

Economic loss	
Value of damaged/lost eggs: \$	
Noneconomic loss	
Pain, suffering, and emotional distress: \$	
Chloe Poynton TOTAL \$	
Adrienne Sletten:	
Economic loss	
Value of damaged/lost eggs: \$	
Noneconomic loss	
Pain, suffering, and emotional distress: \$	
Adrienne Sletten TOTAL \$	
Proceed question 14.	

1	VI. APPORTIONMENT OF FAULT	
2		
3	14. Was Pacific Fertility Center negligent with re	spect to Tank 4?
4		
5	Yes No	
6	If your answer to question 14 is yes, then	answer question 15. If you answered no
7	insert the number zero next to Pacific Fer	- v ·
8		
9	15. Was Pacific Fertility Center's negligence a su	ubstantial factor in causing harm to the
10	plaintiffs?	
11		
12	Yes No	
13	If your group to greation 15 is yes then	anguan avastian 16 Know anguanal na
14	If your answer to question 15 is yes, then insert the number zero next to Pacific Fer	1 0,
15		
16	16. What percentage of responsibility for the plai	ntiffs' harm do you assign to:
17		
18	Chart:	%
19	Pacific Fertility Center:	%
20	TOTAL 100	0/
21	TOTAL 100	70
22		
23	Only proceed to question 17 if you answered plaintiff. If you answered no to question 11, s	•
24	and have the presiding juror sign and date th	

VII.

PUNITIVE DAMAGES
17. Did Chart's failure to recall or retrofit Tank 4's controller constitute malice,
oppression, or fraud?
Yes No
If you answered yes, then answer question 18. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form on the lapage.
18. Was the conduct constituting malice, oppression, or fraud committed by one or mo officers, directors, or managing agents of Chart acting on behalf of Chart?
Yes No
Proceed to the next question.
19. Did an agent or employee of Chart engage in the conduct with malice, oppression, fraud?
Yes No
If you answered yes, then answer question 20. If you answered no, stop here, answer no further questions, and have the presiding juror sign and date this form on the lapage.
20. Did one or more officers, directors, or managing agents of Chart authorize this conduct?
Conduct:
Yes No
Proceed to the next question

Case 3:18-cv-01586-JSC Document 838 Filed 06/04/21 Page 11 of 11

	1	Signed: Presiding Juror
	2	
	3	Dated:
	4	
	5	After this verdict form has been signed, notify the clerk that you are ready to present your verdict
	6	in the courtroom.
	7	
	8	
	9	
	10	
. Court alifornia	11	
	12	
	13	
strict of Ca	14	
es Di trict	15	
United States District Court Northern District of California	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	
	26	